

REMARKS

Status of Claims:

Claims 2 and 5 remain cancelled. New claim 22 is added. Thus, claims 1, 3-4, and 6-22 are present for examination.

Interview with Examiner:

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesy of the telephonic interview on February 9, 2006. In the Interview Summary mailed February 15, 2006, the Examiner indicated that the date of the interview was 08 February 2006, but the interview actually occurred on February 9, 2006. The following individuals participated in the interview: (i) Examiner Bruckart; (ii) Robert Betros, First Named Applicant; (iii) David Blumenthal, Attorney for Applicant; and (iv) Justin Sobaje, Attorney for Applicant. No exhibit was shown, and no demonstrations were conducted.

Before the interview, applicant faxed an Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form with an attached proposed claim amendment to the Examiner. During the interview, we discussed the proposed claim amendment and the cited references, including Webb (U.S. Patent No. 6,880,010) and Cianfrocca et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,796) (hereinafter Cianfrocca).

With regard to the rejection of claims 1 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, applicant proposed to delete the phrase "to a web server" from the claims as shown in the proposed claim amendment to claim 1. Also, we discussed claim 1 with reference to FIG. 1 of the present patent application to show that the claimed features of independent claim 1 have support in the present patent application.

With regard to the rejection of independent claims 1 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb in view of Cianfrocca, we discussed claim distinctions between the proposed amended claim language and the Webb and Cianfrocca references. In particular, we pointed out that the proposed amended claim language recited, among other features, "a web

server, said web server being configured to establish one socket connection with said client through said firewall in response to an HTTP request from said client, said two-way asynchronous communication between said messaging bus and said remote application occurring over said one socket connection.” (Emphasis Added). We pointed out that neither Webb nor Cianfrocca, alone or in combination, disclose such a feature. We discussed FIG. 1 of Webb with the Examiner and pointed out that the notification connection 122 only allows for sending data one way, and we pointed out that the request connection 124 only allows for synchronous communication.

The Examiner agreed that the proposed claim amendment would overcome the cited references. In the Interview Summary mailed February 15, 2006, the Examiner indicated that, “[t]he proposed amendment does overcome the prior art because of its use of the two-way asynchronous across one socket.” (Emphasis Added). Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for such indication.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112:

Claims 1 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claims 1 and 21, as amended, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner stated that the language “remote application being executed by a client to a web server” in claims 1 and 21 was confusing. (Office Action; pages 2-3). Applicant has amended claims 1 and 21 to delete the phrase “to a web server” in order to clarify the claims.

The Examiner further stated that, “[a]nother confusing limitation is the use of sockets and HTTP requests to setup asynchronous connections.” (Office Action; page 3). Also, the Examiner stated that, “HTTP requests are unmistakably synchronous connections through a firewall to a web server.” (Office Action; page 3).

Applicant has now amended claims 1 and 21 to recite the feature that, “said web server configured to establish one socket connection with said client through said firewall and configured to initialize the gateway CGI after receiving an HTTP request to initialize the gateway CGI from said remote application over said one socket connection during a single HTTP transaction with the remote application”. In addition, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite the feature, “wherein the gateway CGI is configured to perform operations to enable said two-way asynchronous communication between said messaging bus and said remote application to occur within the single HTTP transaction and over said one socket connection”. (Emphasis Added). Also, independent claim 21 has been amended to recite the feature, “wherein the gateway CGI is configured such that the operations executed by the gateway CGI enable said two-way asynchronous communication between said messaging bus and said remote application to occur within the single HTTP transaction and over said one socket connection”. (Emphasis Added). Support for such features can be found in the specification at page 7, lines 6-15, and in U.S. Patent Application No. 09/766,439 entitled “System and Method for Maintaining Two-Way Asynchronous Notification between a Client and a Web Server”, the contents of which were incorporated by reference into the present application.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 21, as amended, are believed to be in compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103:

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 10-11, and 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,880,010) (hereinafter Webb) in view of Cianfrocca et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,796) (hereinafter Cianfrocca).

Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb in view of Cianfrocca and further in view of Gutfreund et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,192,394) (hereinafter Gutfreund).

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb in view of Cianfrocca and further in view of Derby et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,426,637) (hereinafter Derby).

With respect to claims 1, 3-4, and 6-21, as amended, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a system for collaborative processing with distributed applications, comprising:

“at least one application context in which an application is executed, the application context including an application CGI for managing the application, and a communication interface on which application data is communicated as messages;

a messaging bus configured to communicate the messages for processing by the application;

at least one gateway context including a gateway CGI configured for maintaining two-way asynchronous communication between the messaging bus and a remote application through a firewall, said remote application being executed by a client, the gateway CGI configured to maintain the two-way asynchronous communication until termination by the remote application or by the gateway CGI; and

a web server, said web server configured to establish one socket connection with said client through said firewall and configured to initialize the gateway CGI after receiving an HTTP request to initialize the gateway CGI from said remote application over said one socket connection during a single HTTP transaction with the remote application;

wherein the gateway CGI is configured to perform operations to enable said two-way asynchronous communication between said messaging bus and said remote application to occur within the single HTTP transaction and over said one socket connection.” (Emphasis Added).

Neither Webb nor Cianfrocca, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a system including the above-quoted features. In the Interview Summary mailed February 15, 2006, the Examiner stated that, “[t]he proposed amendment does overcome the prior art because of its use

of the two-way asynchronous across one socket.” (Emphasis Added). Independent claim 1 as presently amended differs from the proposed amendment submitted to the Examiner before the interview on February 9, 2006. However, independent claim 1 as presently amended does recite the feature of, “wherein the gateway CGI is configured to perform operations to enable said two-way asynchronous communication between said messaging bus and said remote application to occur within the single HTTP transaction and over said one socket connection.” (Emphasis Added). Thus, a system as recited in claim 1 does allow for two-way asynchronous communication across one socket connection and, hence, recites the feature that the Examiner indicated does overcome the prior art.

Therefore, independent claim 1, as amended, is neither disclosed nor suggested by the Webb and Cianfrocca references and, hence, is believed to be allowable. The Patent Office has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Independent claim 21, as amended, recites a system with features similar to features of a system of independent claim 1 and, thus, is believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

The dependent claims are deemed allowable for at least the same reasons indicated above with regard to the independent claims from which they depend.

In addition, with regard to dependent claims 12-13, it is noted that Gutfreund does not cure the deficiencies with respect to the teachings of Webb and Cianfrocca discussed above in connection with independent claim 1. Also, with regard to dependent claims 8-9, it is noted that Derby does not cure the deficiencies with respect to the teachings of Webb and Cianfrocca discussed above in connection with independent claim 1.

New independent claim 22 recites features not found in any of Webb, Cianfrocca, Gutfreund, and Derby.

Conclusion:

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0872. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-0872.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0872.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 3-20-06

By David A. Blumenthal

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 30542
Telephone: (310) 975-7895
Facsimile: (310) 557-8475

David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,257